UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,543	11/21/2001	Toshiharu Katada	111163	1690

25944 7590 03/09/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
PRIETO, BEATRIZ	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/989,543	KATADA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Prieto B.	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/20/2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *11-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *11-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 November 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. *enclosed*
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to request for reconsideration and amendment filed 12/20/2005, claims 11-19 has been examined and remain pending.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC §112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

(i) "data generated by the second device service unit according to a request", recites data generated according to a request, the breadth and scope of generating data *according to* a request, raises uncertainties as to whether *it is or not a request*. Specifically, the use of the adjective "*according to*" meaning, similar, analogous, approximating, alike, agnate, or approximately, as used herein, is vague as to whether it is a request or not. For the purposes of examination it's data.

(ii) the following recitations of intended use in the claim raise as to how this intended use further limits the claim in structure (see MPEP 2106(II)C), particularly, language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation, e.g. to the limiting effect of the language in a claim of statements of intended use or field of use. In this case, "a first/second device service unit that generates data in order to display a web page *used for* the first/second device...", the intended use of the page does not it generation. For the purposes of examination the substance of the claimed limitation reads, generating a web page by a unit where the displayed page includes data (called "symbols") displayed on the screen.

(iii) the claimed clause, "a first web browser unit that sends the request to the first server unit, receives the data sent by the first server unit, and which, *based on the data*, displays the web page used for the first device *including data symbols for* displaying the specific data on a screen", raises uncertainties as to was the specific data in the data generated by the device service unit, since this display seems to only be *based on* that data.

Claim Rejection under 35 USC §103

4. Quotation of the 35 USC 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejection set forth in this office action may be found in previous office action.

5. Claims 11-13, 15, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slotznick in view of Owens et. al. US 5,530,865 (Owens hereafter)

Regarding claims 11, 15, 18 and 19, Slotznick teaches transmission of data between web pages, including

a first web browser unit (13), which, based on data, displays a web page 1 (19 of Fig. 1A) including data symbols displaying the specific data (15) on a screen (11) (Fig. 1A, 0059);

a second web browser (19) which, based on data, displays another web page 2 (17 of Fig. 1A) including other data symbols displaying other specific (21/23) data on the same screen, 0059;

data symbols on the screen included in the one web page are drag-and-dropped in a predetermined area of the other web page [0003-0004, 0009];

the web browser unit displaying the web page from where the data symbol was dragged transfers over location information of the specific data to the other web browser unit [0005, 0022, 0045], including transferring location information of the specific data (e.g. a link) from a first device associated with specific data and/or the specific data resides. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the web browser discussed in Slotznick is operated on the computer with an application program which generates data to be displayed by the browser, namely, the web page from code file obtained locally or remotely, this executed by the browser controls or tells the browser window how to display the generated data. The data is generated by and used within application programs, which cause computers to perform useful functions such as word processing, browsing web pages, accessing databases, etc.

However, the data symbols on the screen in the Slotznick system drag-and-dropped in a between windows displayed on the same screen, do not represent devices.

Owens teaches transferring data between a first and a second window displayed on the same screen in a graphical user interface environment, wherein application programs associated with each respective window generate data for displaying respective first and second window (col 2/lines 3-49),

where data symbols on the screen used for representing devices and files are drag-and-dropped in a between windows (col 8/lines 1-19, 25-31), windows displayed on the same screen (col 8/lines 35-43);

drag-and-drop of data symbols on the screen between windows causes the hand over of location information of location of a device where data associated with the data symbols is located to be retrieved and sent to another device according to a request to another device (col 12/lines 10-49);

receive data handlers associated with the window called by a drag handler to handle drag service request invocation (col 18/lines 54-56, col 20/lines 14-20) which are relayed to the destination application associated with the service invoked (col 33/lines 59-col 34/line 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Owens, because in doing so this would support an architecture for direct manipulation of data to and from application programs and files in a file system in the Slotznick system extending the web based windowing environment to particularly include the invocation of certain system services through the use of drag-and-drop operations, where destinations include system services devices wherein the drop operation indicates the performance of that system service device. One would be motivated to access these system services may be accessed using select, drag, and drop operations, suggested by Owens.

Regarding claims 12-13, the use of HTTP [Slotznick, 0028], however does not teach the use of FTP.

Official Notice (*see MPEP § 2144.03 Reliance on "Well Known" Prior Art)* is taken FTP specifications set forth by RFC 959 in 1985 was old and well know at the time the invention was made. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to this file transfer protocol given the suggestion of Owens for performing file transfers associated displayed windowing environment. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to use the protocol for its objective such as promote sharing of files (computer programs and/or data), 2) to encourage indirect or implicit (via programs) use of remote computers, 3) to shield a user from variations in file storage systems among hosts, and 4) to transfer data reliably and efficiently.

6. Claims 14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slotznick in view of Owens in view of RFC 2567, Design Goals for an Internet Printing Protocol, Wright, F. D., April 1999 (Wright hereafter).

Regarding claims 14, 16 and 17, however the above-mentioned prior art do not teach the use of Internet Printing Protocol (IPP).

Wright discloses all aspects of a new Internet Printing Protocol (IPP), as an application level protocol that can be used for distributed printing using Internet tools and technologies. Disclosure here covers any device capable of marking on a piece of media using nay available technology besides printers. Specifically, disclosing a driver unit to generate the print data stream for the intended printer. The generation of the proper print data stream is accomplished in an application on that computer. A group of hosts request services from a line printer daemon process (LPD) running on a host implementing a set of rules for communication thereto.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize IPP because in doing so it allow end-users and operators to query printer capabilities, submit print jobs, inquire about the status of print jobs and printers, and cancel print jobs. One would also be motivated to correlate the line printer daemon processes (LPR) with the IPP for supporting communication between them, as suggested by Wright and enable transporting over HTTP data whose content is formatted according to IPP which will support normal applications such as those discussed by Slotznick and Owens such as programs as word processors, spreadsheets, data-base applications, WEB browsers, production printing applications, etc., as disclosed by Wright.

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slotznick in view of Schilit et. al. US 6,670,968 (Schilit hereafter)

Regarding claims 11, 15, 18 and 19, Slotznick teaches transmission of data between web pages, including

a first web browser unit (13), which, based on data, displays a web page 1 (19 of Fig. 1A) including data symbols displaying the specific data (15) on a screen (11) (Fig. 1A, 0059);

a second web browser (19) which, based on data, displays another web page 2 (17 of Fig. 1A) including other data symbols displaying other specific (21/23) data on the same screen, 0059;

data symbols on the screen included in the one web page are drag-and-dropped in a predetermined area of the other web page [0003-0004, 0009];

the web browser unit displaying the web page from where the data symbol was dragged transfers over location information of the specific data to the other web browser unit [0005, 0022, 0045], including transferring location information of the specific data (e.g. a link) from a first device associated with specific data and/or the specific data resides. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the web browser discussed in Slotznick is operated on the computer with an application program which generates data to be displayed by the browser, namely, the web page from code file obtained locally or

remotely, this executed by the browser controls or tells the browser window how to display the generated data. The data is generated by and used within application programs, which cause computers to perform useful functions such as word processing, browsing web pages, accessing databases, etc.

However, the data symbols on the screen in the Slotznick system drag-and-dropped in a between windows displayed on the same screen, do not represent devices.

Schilit discloses the use of web pages used for devices providing specific services,

including generating html data to display a web page used for a device. A document service associated with a physical device (e.g., a print service), the service forms are HTML Web pages sent to the browser, such as print service web page form Fig. 4, the document services are displayed as a page for invoking a specific service, such as printing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Schilit in doing so this would support an architecture for direct manipulation of data to and from application programs and files in a file system in the Slotznick system extending the web based windowing environment to particularly include the invocation of certain system services through the use of drag-and-drop operations invocable by the displayed object (data symbols) by supporting the web based environment, where destinations include system services devices, as suggested by Schili.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Citation of Pertinent Art:

9. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Copies of Non-Patent Literature documents cited will be provided as set forth in MPEP§ 707.05(a):

The Satchel system architecture: Mobile access to documents and services, Flynn Mike, et. al., Mobile Networks and Applications 5, 2000, pages 243–258.

Flynn discloses the architecture of a system called "Satchel" that supports mobile document work by providing streamlined access to remote documents, via a mobile browser running on mobile device,

which additionally, provides a set of specialized document services that are required to support mobile document work such as printing, faxing, and scanning (see page 243, left column). *Easy access to document services*, providing a simple way to locate and use document services such as printing, faxing or scanning. A document service might be associated with a physical device (e.g., a print service). The service forms are just normal HTML Web pages and forms, arranged by local system administrators, which, once again, are translated to Halibut on the fly, and sent to the browser (left column, print service web page form Fig. 5 on p. 247 and web (HTML) page Fax service form on Fig. 6 on p. 251). The document services are displayed as a page for invoking a specific service, such as printing, with various options or in the case of multifunction machines, a directory of such service forms could be returned (right column on p. 244). Displaying the second web page (e.g. print service form) forwards the handed over location information to the second (e.g. print) device service using e.g. Fetch Service (section 7.1 on p. 248), and *acquires specific data obtained associated with the forwarded location information, and sends the specific data over to the second device*, e.g. printer (print service which fetches and prints section 7.3, p. 249).

The designer's model of CUA Workplace, Berry, R.E., IBM System Journal, vol 31, No. 3, 1992, p. 429-458.

Berry teaches viewing in a window the content of objects used for representing devices, specifically, object containing device behavior. Device behavior includes the ability to print and transfer to external media devices data. For example, a printer is a device object that is connected to a real-world physical device, where the objects are draggable, thereby containing the same functionalities as icons or links.

RFC 959: FILE TRANSFER PROTOCOL (FTP), Postel, J., et. al., October 1985

The objectives of FTP are 1) to promote sharing of files (computer programs and/or data), 2) to encourage indirect or implicit (via programs) use of remote computers, 3) to shield a user from variations in file storage systems among hosts, and 4) to transfer data reliably and efficiently. FTP, though usable directly by a user at a terminal, is designed mainly for use by programs.

RFC 2567, Design Goals for an Internet Printing Protocol, Wright, F.D., April 1999.

Wright discloses all aspects of a new Internet Printing Protocol (IPP), as an application level protocol that can be used for distributed printing using Internet tools and technologies. Disclosure here covers any device capable of marking on a piece of media using nay available technology besides printers. Specifically, disclosing a driver unit to generate the print data stream for the intended printer. The generation of the proper print data stream is accomplished in an application on that computer. A group of hosts request services from a line printer daemon process running on a host.

RFC 1179, Line Printer Daemon Protocol, McLaughlin III, L., August 1990

This RFC describes an existing print server protocol widely used on the Internet for communicating between line printer daemons (both clients and servers). The Berkeley versions of the Unix(tm) operating system provide line printer spooling with a collection of programs: lpr (assign to queue), lpq (display the queue), lprm (remove from queue), and lpc (control the queue). These programs interact with an autonomous process called the line printer daemon, this RFC describes the protocols with which a line printer daemon client may control printing.

(US 5,724,595)

Genter discloses where web pages, e.g. hypertext pages typically have multiple links to other pages, each link has an associated address identifying the page that it points to, e.g. URL of destination location of the host server where the document is stored (col 1/lines 9-13); In a World Wide Web environment, the links are displayed by a browser as colored and underlined text, referred to as the link anchor within the current (web page) displayed by the browser (col 1/lines 14-20); these links representing a web page accessible via its link are draggable from one web page to another (col 1/lines 40-46); Genter teaches the first web browser unit displaying first web page moving one of a location information of the specific data (e.g. URL/link) to the second web browser unit displaying a second web page (Fig. 2-3, col 3/lines 35-55),

(US 5,490,245)

Conventional graphical user interfaces (GUIs), such as Microsoft Windows, make extensive use of graphic elements, or icons, to represent computer applications, functions and documents. These icons may be directly manipulated by a user, using a mouse or other such pointing device, to perform useful tasks. For example, a document icon may be "dragged" to and "dropped" on a printer icon to cause a document represented by the document icon to be printed on a printer represented by the printer icon.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3902. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Andrew T. Caldwell can be reached at (571) 272-3868. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, status information for published application may be obtained from either Private or Public PAIR, for unpublished application Private PAIR only (see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov or the Electronic Business Center at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand carried or delivered to:
Customer Service Window located at the Randolph Bldg.
401 Dulany St.
Alexandria, VA 22314

Faxed to the Central Fax Office:
(571) 273-8300 or telephone (571) 272-2100 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office.

Beatriz Prieto

BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER